

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
BRUNSWICK DIVISION**

GARY TYRE, et al.,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE WAYNE COUNTY SHERIFF'S
DEPARTMENT, et al.,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO.: 2:16-cv-110

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Defendants' Motion to Stay Discovery. (Doc. 6). Defendants submit that discovery should be stayed until such time as the Court enters a ruling on their Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint, in Part (doc. 5). After careful consideration, Defendants' Motion is **GRANTED**.

Defendant submits that discovery and the requirements of Local Rule 26.1 and Federal Rule 26 should be stayed until such time as the Court enters a ruling on its Motion to Dismiss (doc. 5).

With regard to the timing of discovery, the Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit has recognized that

[i]f the district court dismisses a nonmeritorious claim before discovery has begun, unnecessary costs to the litigants and to the court system can be avoided. Conversely, delaying ruling on a motion to dismiss such a claim until after the parties complete discovery encourages abusive discovery and, if the court ultimately dismisses the claim, imposes unnecessary costs. For these reasons, any legally unsupported claim that would unduly enlarge the scope of discovery should be eliminated before the discovery stage, if possible.

Chudasama v. Mazda Motor Corp., 123 F.3d 1353, 1368 (11th Cir. 1997) (footnotes omitted). For these reasons, this Court, and other courts within the Eleventh Circuit, routinely find good cause to stay the discovery period where there is a pending motion to dismiss. See, e.g., Habib v. Bank of Am. Corp., No. 1:10-cv-04079-SCJ-RGV, 2011 WL 2580971, at *6 n.4 (N.D. Ga. Mar. 15, 2011) (citing Chudasama, 123 F.3d at 1368) (“[T]here is good cause to stay discovery obligations until the District Judge rules on [the defendants’] motion to dismiss to avoid undue expense to both parties.”); Berry v. Canady, No. 2:09-cv-765-FtM-29SPC, 2011 WL 806230, at *1 (M.D. Fla. Mar. 2, 2011) (quoting Moore v. Potter, 141 F. App’x 803, 807 (11th Cir. 2005)) (“[N]either the parties nor the court have any need for discovery before the court rules on the motion [to dismiss].”).

In the case at hand, the Court finds that good cause exists to stay this case until such time as a ruling is made on Defendants’ motion and that no prejudice will accrue to the parties if a stay is granted. Specifically, a ruling on Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss before the commencement of discovery may save the parties time and resources by clarifying what issues the parties will need to address in discovery.

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that all proceedings, including discovery, are stayed pending a ruling by the Court on Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that **within twenty-one (21) days** following the Court’s ruling on Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss, should this case remain pending before the Court, the parties are directed to meet and confer pursuant to Rule 26(f). Additionally, the parties are to file a Rule 26(f) Report

within fourteen (14) days of the Rule 26(f) conference at which time a Scheduling Order will be entered by the Court.

SO ORDERED, this 19th day of August, 2016.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "R. Stan Baker". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "R." and last name "Baker" being more prominent than the middle name "Stan".

R. STAN BAKER
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA